

Remarks

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. The specification has been amended. Claims 1, 13, 25, 30, 31, 37, 41, and 45 have been amended. Claims 5, 17, 29, and 35 are canceled. No claims have been added. Claims 46-64 were previously canceled. Therefore, claims 1-4, 6-16, 18-28, 30-34, and 36-45 are presented for examination.

Objections

Claim 13 stands objected to under 37 CFR §1.75(a) as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention or discovery. Claim 13 has been amended to clarify that the look-up table is the same as the LUT recited later in the claim. Therefore, applicant submits that the present objection has been overcome and respectfully requests its withdrawal.

35 U.S.C. §101 Rejection

Claims 1-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office Action states that “[c]laims 1-45 recite the mere manipulation of data or an abstract idea, or merely solve a mathematical problem without a limitation to a practical application.” (Office Action mailed 4/17/08 at pg. 3.) Independent claims 1, 13, 25, 30, 31, 37, 41, and 45 have been amended to recite that a transform is applied to a block of scaled coefficients that represent a block of information, the transform in order to decode the block of information. Applicant submits that claims 1-45 provide a “useful, concrete, and tangible result”, namely applying a transform in order to

decode a block of information. The final result is the decoded block of information. This is more than “merely manipul[at]ing] data without ever producing a useful, concrete, and tangible result.” (Id.) Therefore, applicant submits that the present §101 rejection has been overcome and respectfully requests its withdrawal.

Claims 13-24, 25-29, 37-40 and 41-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office Action states that “claims 13-24 and 37-40 define a decoder embodying functional descriptive material, and claims 25-29 and 41-44 define an article of manufacture embodying functional descriptive material.” (Id. at pg. 4.) Claims 13, 25, 37, and 41 have been amended to embodying the claims in a computer implementation. As such, claims 13, 25, 37, 41, and their respective dependent claims, are directed to statutory subject matter and have overcome the present §101 rejection. As a result, applicant respectfully requests the present §101 rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection

Claims 1-9, 12-21 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Wiegand (“Joint Committee Draft (CD)”). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Wiegand.

Wiegand discloses text of a committee draft of the Joint Video Specification, known as H.264. H.264 aims to provide standards for coding of moving pictures and associated audio for various applications such as digital storage media, distribution, and communication. (Wiegand at Introduction, pg. ix.)

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A decoding process comprising:

 scaling a block of coefficients that represents a block of information using a scaling factor determined for each coefficient by computing an index for said each coefficient and indexing a look-up table (LUT) using the index, wherein the index is based on a quantization parameter, a size of the block of coefficients, and a position of said each coefficient within the block; and

 applying a transform to the block of scaled coefficients in order to decode the block of information;

 wherein the LUT is used independently of the block size, such that the LUT supports the transform being for one of a plurality of block sizes.

Applicant submits that Wiegand does not disclose or suggest indexing a look-up table (LUT) wherein the LUT is used independently of the block size, such that the LUT supports the transform being for one of a plurality of block sizes, as recited by claim 1. The Office Action states that this feature is taught in Wiegand at table 14-1 in section 14.3.2.2 “wherein the same lookup table 14-1 is used regardless of whether mode 8x8, 8x4, 4x8, or 4x4 is used.” (Office Action at pg. 8.) However, Wiegand specifically states that the “coefficient $R(k,i,j)$ used in the following [table 14-1] is mode dependent and chosen from the table below.” (Wiegand at §14.3.2.2.) Wiegand continues with defining which portions of the table are used for the various block sizes (modes) utilized in the scaling of SBT transform coefficients. (Id.) Wiegand makes clear that Table 14-1 is divided into different sections based on which mode (block size) is being utilized. As such, Wiegand expressly teaches that the LUT is **not** used independently of the block size and the LUT does **not** support the transform being for one of a plurality of block sizes. As a result, Wiegand does not disclose or suggest the each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1, as well as its dependent claims, is patentable over Wiegand.

Independent claim 13 also recites, in part, indexing a look-up table (LUT) wherein the LUT is used independently of the block size, such that the LUT supports the transform being for one of a plurality of block sizes. As discussed above, Wiegand does not disclose or suggest such a feature. Therefore, claim 13 as well as its dependent claims, is patentable over Wiegand for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

Claims 25-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegand (“Joint Committee Draft (CD)”) in view of Boon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,368). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Wiegand in view of Boon. Independent claims 25 and 30 recite, in part, indexing a look-up table (LUT) wherein the LUT is used independently of the block size, such that the LUT supports the transform being for one of a plurality of block sizes. As discussed above, Wiegand does not disclose or suggest such a feature. In addition, applicant submits that Boon also does not disclose or suggest this feature. Therefore, claims 25 and 30, as well as their respective dependent claims, are patentable over Wiegand in view of Boon.

Claims 10, 11, 22, 23, 31-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegand in view of Ohki (U.S. Patent 5,519,503). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Wiegand in view of Ohki. Independent claims 31 and 37 recite, in part, indexing a look-up table (LUT) wherein the LUT is used independently of the block size, such that the LUT supports the transform being for one of a plurality of block sizes. As discussed above, Wiegand does not disclose or suggest such a feature. In addition,

applicant submits that Ohki also does not disclose or suggest this feature. Therefore, claims 31 and 37, as well as their respective dependent claims, are patentable over Wiegand in view of Ohki.

Claims 41-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegand in view of Boon, and further in view of Ohki. Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Wiegand in view of Boon and further in view of Ohki. Independent claims 41 and 45 recite, in part, indexing a look-up table (LUT) wherein the LUT is used independently of the block size, such that the LUT supports the transform being for one of a plurality of block sizes. As discussed above, Wiegand does not disclose or suggest such a feature. In addition, applicant submits that neither of Boon nor Ohki disclose or suggest this feature. Therefore, claims 41 and 45, as well as their respective dependent claims, are patentable over Wiegand in view of Boon and further in view of Ohki.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Applicant respectfully petitions for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 7/17/08



Michael J. Mallie
Reg. No. 36,591

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(303) 740-1980